



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,073	03/16/2001	Lee Codel Lawson Tarbotton	00.164.01	5551

7590 05/23/2006

Zilka-Kotab, PC
P.O.Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120

EXAMINER

SIMITOSKI, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/809,073

Applicant(s)

TARBOTTON ET AL.

Examiner

Michael J. Simitoski

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-16,18-22,24-30,32-36 and 38-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-16,18-22,24-30,32-36 and 38-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The response of 4/10/2006 was received and considered.
2. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-16, 18-22, 24-30, 32-36 & 38-46 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 4/10/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. It is noted that Applicant's amendments to the claims are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(c). For example, the use of a single bracket set ([]) is not compliant with 37 CFR 1.121(c)(2); rather a strike-through should be used or a double bracket ([[]]) may be used when deleting five or fewer characters or when a strike-through is not easily perceived. The response has been considered as a bona fide attempt, however, any further submissions not compliant with 37 CFR 1.121(c) will be treated as such, according to MPEP §714.
5. Applicant's response (p. 11) argues that "undesired" is described in the specification. However, this argument is moot, as applicant has removed this language from the claims.
6. Applicant's response (pp. 11-12) argues that "non-virus" is to be read with regards to its plain and ordinary meaning, as evidenced by dictionary definitions. Applicant cites a definition from the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. Therefore, the term "virus" and as such it's opposite "non-virus" will be interpreted with regards to their plain and ordinary meaning. Applicant's definition is considered appropriate; as well, the Examiner cites Kephart's definition (col. 1, lines 17-21). Therefore, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 are withdrawn.
7. Applicant's response (p. 12) argues that "the Kephart reference teaches only the identification of virus signatures from a list or from files containing invariant viral code for the

Art Unit: 2134

purpose of future extraction (col. 5, lines 57-61)", but "applicant's logic differentiates between the identification of computer viruses and computer programs banned from use and performs the identification of the computer programs banned from use after the computer virus identification". However, since Kephart's invention identifies both virus and non-virus (programs banned from use), it is an inherent feature of the Kephart invention to identify a program banned from use after identifying a virus. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

8. Applicant's response (p. 13) also introduces new claims. Specifically, claim 43 recites (similar to claim 44) "wherein the at least one non-virus computer program includes at least one of a game or a data streaming program". However, Kephart discloses detecting and removing both virus and non-virus programs. Lavasoft (previously cited) teaches detecting and removing adware. The instantly cited patent to Fuller discloses that adware streams data. Therefore, it is submitted that the limitation regarding the non-virus programs including data streaming programs is an obvious variation over these references. Regarding claim 44, Kephart, as modified by Lavasoft and Fuller, lacks the non-virus programs including games. However, Brown teaches that it is known for an employer to prevent the addition of games onto an employee computer (col. 4, lines 10-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kephart such that the non-virus computer programs further include games. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to enable employers to prevent the addition of the games to employee computers, as taught by Brown (col. 4, lines 10-12).

9. Applicant's response (p. 13) introduces additional claim 45, reciting that the anti-virus logic of a plurality of end users each includes a different selected set of computer programs

Art Unit: 2134

banned from use. However, Kephart discloses the user is the entity supplying a file from which signatures are extracted (col. 5, lines 57-61). Therefore, it is an inherent feature of Kephart that each end user anti computer virus logic includes a different selected set of computer programs (user-selected signatures) banned from use.

10. Applicant's response (p. 13) introduces an additional claim 46. Kephart lacks receiving a file access request and scanning the file, as claimed. However, Golds teaches that it is known to stack software modules as file system filter drivers that intercept file system-directed requests to a base file system for virus scanning (§3 & §8) and send a failed response/return if the operation is not passed (§31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kephart to intercept a file access request and perform an anti-virus scan and return a fail response to an operating is the anti-virus scan is not passed to filter requests to a file system as is known in the art. Kephart is silent to the limitation that if said anti-virus scan is passed, a scan for the computer programs banned from use is performed. However, it is inherent in Kephart that all signatures will be scanned and therefore, if one signature does not match a file, the next will be checked. Therefore, since Kephart scans a file with respect to virus and non-virus files, it is inherent that when a virus signature does not match the file being scanned, the file will be scanned for the remaining signatures, at least one corresponding to a non-virus file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2134

12. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Regarding claim 44, it is unclear how one program can include the plural “games” or “data streaming programs”. *For the purposes of this Office Action, the claim is understood to recite the following: “wherein a plurality of non-virus programs are specified to be banned from use and the plurality of non-virus programs include games and data streaming programs.”*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

14. Claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 15, 18, 21, 27, 29, 32, 35, 41 & 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,452,442 to **Kephart**.

Regarding claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 15, 18, 21, 27, 29, 32, 35 & 41, Kephart discloses a user controlled program specifying logic (col. 5, lines 57-61) to specify said at least one computer program to be banned from use (col. 1, lines 35-49 & col. 5, lines 57-61), said at least one computer program comprising an undesired, non-virus computer program (col. 1, lines 15-34), and banned program identifying data generating logic responsive to said user controlled program specifying logic to generate banned program identifying data/signature (col. 5, lines 57-61) for at

Art Unit: 2134

least one computer program to be banned from use, said banned program identifying data being operable to control anti computer virus logic/scanner (col. 1, lines 35-49) to identify computer programs banned from use (col. 1, lines 35-49 & col. 2, lines 5-12). While Kephart is silent regarding the order of identifying computer viruses and programs banned from use, it is an inherent feature of Kephart's invention that the anti computer virus logic will identify computer viruses prior to identifying the computer programs banned from use.

Regarding claim 45, Kephart discloses the user supplying a file from which signatures are extracted (col. 5, lines 57-61). Therefore, it is an inherent feature of Kephart that each end user anti computer virus logic includes a different selected set of computer programs banned from use.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 2, 8, 16, 22, 30 & 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kephart**, as applied to claims 1, 7, 15, 21, 29 & 35 above, in further view of "Bad IDEA" by Peter Szor (**Szor**), in further view of "Cryptography in Everyday Life" by Sarah Simpson (**Simpson**). Kephart lacks encrypting the banned program identifying data/signatures with a private key. However, Szor teaches that to prevent modification of antivirus signature files, the files should be encrypted (p. 19, col. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

Art Unit: 2134

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kephart to encrypt the banned program identifying data/signatures. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to prevent modification of antivirus signature files, as taught by Szor (p. 19, col. 2). As modified, Symantec lacks using a private key. However, Simpson teaches that by encrypting a file with a private key, the sender of the encrypted file can be verified by decrypting it with the corresponding public key (p. 1, ¶1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a private key. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to verify the creator of the signature files, as taught by Simpson (p. 1).

17. Claims 5, 19 & 33, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kephart**, as applied to claims 4, 18 & 32 above, in further view of “Heuristic Anti-Virus Technology” by **Veldman**. Kephart discloses detecting known viruses, but lacks the banned program identifying data including heuristic data identifying one or more behavioral characteristics. However, Veldman teaches that using heuristics and examining behaviors of a program allows detection of unknown viruses (§1 & §2.1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to including in the identifying data, heuristic data identifying one or more behavioral characteristics. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to detect unknown computer viruses, as taught by Veldman (§1, ¶1 & §2.1).

Art Unit: 2134

18. Claims 10, 24 & 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kephart, Szor and Simpson**, as applied claims 8, 22 & 36 above, in further view of U.S. Patent 5,844,986 to **Davis**. Kephart, as modified above, lacks storing the identifying data in a secure memory region. However, Davis teaches that to prevent a virus from corrupting a BIOS (secure flash memory), an authentication and validation procedure is required before the contents of the BIOS memory can be modified (col. 1, lines 32-45, lines 63-67 & col. 2, lines 1-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the identifying data in a secure memory region (memory requiring authentication). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to prevent a virus from corrupting the identifying data, as taught by Davis (col. 1, lines 32-45 & 63-67).

19. Claims 11-12, 25-26 & 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kephart**, as applied to claims 7, 21 & 35 above, in view of "Norton AntiVirus User's Guide", by Symantec Corporation (**Symantec**).

Regarding claims 11, 25 & 39, Kephart, as modified above, lacks explicitly triggering a banned program action. However, Symantec teaches that it is known to alert a user for a response (pp. 39-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kephart's scanner to trigger a banned program action such as deleting the banned computer program (p. 40). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to allow the user to rid the computer of the virus if the repair is not successful, as taught by Symantec (pp. 39-40).

Regarding claim 12, 26 & 40, Kephart, as modified above, lacks responding to an absence of said user generated banned program identifying data. However, Symantec teaches that it is important to have the most up-to-date virus signatures/banned program identifying data (p. 11) and that the signatures can be updated by restoring them from a remote source (p. 18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kephart, as modified above, to respond to an absence of banned program identifying data by restoring the data from a remote source. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to keep the system up-to-date, as taught by Symantec (pp. 11 & 18).

20. Claims 6, 14, 20, 28, 34 & 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kephart**, as applied to claims 1, 7, 15, 21, 29 & 35 above, in view of U.S. Patent 6,694,434 to McGee et al. (**McGee**). Kephart lacks the banned program identifying data comprising data identifying permitted compute programs with all computer programs not matching a permitted computer program being identified as a computer program banned from use. However, McGee teaches that it would be desirable to control whether a calling application can execute on a processor, since unauthorized applications can be inadvertently downloaded onto a system (col. 2, lines 35-41). McGee further discloses that each calling application's unique application verification data is generated upon it's calling and compared to a list of authorized programs (col. 3, line 64 – col. 4, line 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kephart so that the banned program identifying data comprising data identifying permitted compute programs with all computer

programs not matching a permitted computer program being identified as a computer program banned from use. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to protect a computer against inadvertently downloaded unauthorized programs, as taught by McGee (col. 2, lines 35-41 & col. 3, line 64 – col. 4, line 4).

21. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kephart**, as applied to claim 1, in view of “Ad-aware” by **Lavasoft** and U.S. Patent 6,216,112 to Fuller et al. (**Fuller**). Kephart lacks the non-virus computer program including at least one of a game and a data streaming program. However, Lavasoft teaches that it is known to detect and remove spyware and adware (p. 1) because spyware can, for example, change a user’s system (p. 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kephart to include spyware/adware in the signatures, allowing the anti-virus logic to delete the adware/spyware. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification because detecting and removing adware and spyware is known in the art as beneficial, as taught by Lavasoft (p. 1). As modified, Kephart lacks explicitly a data streaming program. However, Fuller teaches that it is known in the art to install adware in a computer system, where the adware contacts servers and downloads new advertisements (streams data) (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Kephart to use the anti-virus software to remove data streaming programs. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification because adware streams data, as taught by Fuller (abstract).

22. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kephart, Lavasoft, and Fuller**, in further view of U.S. Patent 5,859,968 to Brown et al. (**Brown**).

Regarding claim 44, Kephart, as modified above by Lavasoft and Fuller, lacks the non-virus programs further including games. However, Brown teaches that it is known for an employer to prevent the addition of games onto an employee computer (col. 4, lines 10-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kephart such that the non-virus computer programs further include games. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to enable employers to prevent the addition of the games to employee computers, as taught by Brown (col. 4, lines 10-12).

23. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kephart**, as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0020245 to Golds et al. (**Golds**). Kephart, as described above, lacks receiving a file access request and scanning the file. However, Golds teaches that it is known to stack software modules as file system filter drivers that intercept file system-directed requests to a base file system for virus scanning (§3 & §8) and send a failed response/return if the operation is not passed (§31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kephart to intercept a file access request and perform an anti-virus scan and return a fail response to an operating is the anti-virus scan is not passed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to filter

Art Unit: 2134

requests to a file system as is known in the art, as taught by Golds (¶¶3 & 8). As modified, Kephart is silent as to the limitation that if said anti-virus scan is passed, a scan for the computer programs banned from use is performed. However, it is inherent in Kephart that all signatures will be scanned and therefore, if one signature does not match a file, the next will be checked. Therefore, since Kephart scans a file with respect to virus and non-virus files, it is inherent that when a virus signature does not match the file being scanned, the file will be scanned for the remaining signatures, at least one corresponding to a non-virus file.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

b. The '920 patent is cited for teaching identifying viruses before other non-virus data (cols. 4-5), but lacks motivation for doing so.

c. The patent publication to Le-Rouzo is cited for teaching detecting non-virus programs, but does not constitute prior art.

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2134

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Simitoski whose telephone number is (571) 272-3841. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:45 a.m. - 4:15 p.m.. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays from 6:45 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis Jacques can be reached at (571) 272-6962.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300
(for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-3841 (Examiner's fax, for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2134

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJS



May 11, 2006


JACQUES H. LOUIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER